



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/422,976	10/22/1999	MICHAEL CARROLL	52817.000082	6195

29315 7590 09/10/2003

MINTZ LEVIN COHN FERRIS GLOVSKY AND POPEO PC
12010 SUNSET HILLS ROAD
SUITE 900
RESTON, VA 20190

[REDACTED] EXAMINER

QUELER, ADAM M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2178	[REDACTED]

DATE MAILED: 09/10/2003

10

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

21

M

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/422,976	CARROLL, MICHAEL
	Examiner Adam M Queler	Art Unit 2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 June 2003.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
 If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
 a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
 |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
 | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

21

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: Amendment A filed 6/19/2003.
2. Claims 1-26 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 16, 20, and 23 are independent claims.
3. The objection to the claim numbering has been withdrawn in view of Applicant's amendment.
4. The rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, except those pertaining to dependent claim 8, have been withdrawn in view of Applicant's amendment.
5. Claims 1-26 remain rejected in view of the previously cited art.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

6. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 8 recites the limitation "the region information" in line 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. This seems to be a simple omission of the change of "region information" to "structure information" as was done in the rest of the claims. It will be treated as such for examining purposes only.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

7. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

8. Claims 1-6, 8, 11, 12, 14-18, 20-21, 23-25, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by “Cascading Style Sheets in Internet Explorer 4.0 and Examples” by George Young, hereinafter Young-MSDN.

In the course of the following rejections, specific examples of code will be used to reject the claims. However, Applicant should note that similar teachings are made throughout the whole of the document.

Regarding dependent claim 1, Young-MSDN discloses a method of storing structure information for two independently formattable regions and storing content information, wherein the structure is governed by structure information and the content is governed by content information (p.7, “Choosing”). The <p> tags define two regions, their format determined by their associated independent classes. The text is the content information, located in the content field, defined in between the start and end tags. Young-MSDN also teaches that these can all be in one file (p. 3-4, “Using Embedded...”), where the style definition is located in style tags, at the beginning of the same document.

Regarding dependent claim 2, Young-MSDN discloses unique content fields (p.7, “Choosing”), as the content of each paragraph is different.

Regarding dependent claim 3, Young-MSDN discloses two attribute fields associated with the structure information (p.7, “Choosing”). The attributes are definitions of font family, font size, text alignment, and letter spacing.

Regarding dependent claim 4, Young-MSDN teaches the attributes comprise bolding (p.12, “Font Properties”-“font-weight”).

Regarding dependent claim 5, Young-MSDN discloses each region is associated with a unique content field (p.7, “Choosing”). Each region contains different text as the content.

Regarding dependent claim 6, Young-MSDN discloses one region field has a unique combination of the content field and the attribute field (p.7, “Choosing”). Each paragraph has different attributes, as well as different text.

Regarding dependent claim 8, Young-MSDN discloses the structure information, the content information, and the attribute information (p.7, “Choosing”). The text is the content information, located in the content field, defined in between the start and end tags. The attributes are definitions of font family, font size, text alignment, and letter spacing. Young-MSDN also teaches that these can all be in one file (p. 3-4, “Using Embedded...”), where the style definition is located in style tags, at the beginning of the same document.

Regarding dependent claim 11, Young-MSDN discloses a region, the <p> tag, has at least one associated region default attribute (p.8, “A Note...”). As shown, although there is no attribute definition for text alignment the paragraph text is left-aligned by default.

Regarding dependent claim 12, Young-MSDN discloses the associated region default attribute may be overridden in the associated attribute field (p. 22). The default value of left-alignment as recited in claim 1 above, is being overridden with other values.

Regarding dependent claim 14, Young-MSDN teaches the content information is linked information (p.5, “HTML Element” *NOTE: The words “link” and “another” are both links, but due to the lack of color, do not appear as such, on line 20. They can be verified at the web site.*)

Regarding independent claim 16, Young-MSDN discloses storing structure information, content information, and attribute information, wherein the attribute and content information are

associated with the structure information (p.7, “Choosing”). As Young-MSDN teaches HTML, there must inherently be a system with a storage unit to store the document, and processor unit to process the document. Young-MSDN also teaches that these can all be in one file (p. 3-4, “Using Embedded...”), where the style definition is located in style tags, at the beginning of the same document.

Regarding independent claim 23, the computer usable medium for the system of claim 16 is rejected under the same rationale.

Regarding dependent claims 17 and 24, Young-MSDN teaches the structure information, defined by the tags, governs the structure of the document, the content information, located between the tags, governs the content within each region, and the attribute information, defined in the style sheet and referenced in the tags, governs the format of each region. (p. 7, “Choosing”).

Regarding independent claim 20, Young-MSDN discloses storing structure information corresponding to regions of the electronic document, and associating attribute information and content information with each of the regions, the attributes governing a presentation of the electronic document and the content information governing the content of the region when rendered (p.7, “Choosing”). Young-MSDN also teaches that these can all be in one file (p. 3-4, “Using Embedded...”), where the style definition is located in style tags, at the beginning of the same document.

Regarding dependent claims 15, 18, 21 and 25, Young-MSDN teaches one of the attribute fields comprises a functional attribute, such as its class (p.7, “Choosing”). The class can be used

to convey that the region has a specific function and will be treated differently as such (pp. 5-6, “Class as Selector”).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claims 9-10, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Young-MSDN.

Regarding dependent claim 9 and 22, Young-MSDN teaches a file as recited in claim 8 above. Young-MSDN is silent as to storing the information in a table. However since a table was a well-known structure to store data, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use a table so that the information would be easier to read.

Regarding dependent claim 10, Young-MSDN teaches a document management file in the form of a standardized markup language as recited in claim 8 above (p.7, “Choosing”). Young-MSDN does not teach translating it from the table of claim 9. However, given the obviousness of the table of claim 9, it would have been further obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, to translate the table into a markup language so that it could be read by standard browsers.

11. Claims 13, 19, and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Young-MSDN in view of Fields et al. (USPN 6128655—filed 6/10/1998) hereinafter Fields.

Regarding dependent claims 13, 19 and 26, Young-MSDN is silent as translating into a plurality of HTML documents. Fields teaches a method for splitting parts of a web page to an HTML file (col. 3, ll. 2-9). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to repeat this process with a different filter, which would create a plurality of web pages, so that data could be in the separate files needed for frame use. It would also have been obvious to combine Fields and Young-MSDN for the same reason.

12. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Young-MSDN in view of Netscape Screenshot (©1997)

Regarding dependent claim 7, Young-MSDN is silent as to email. However, Netscape shows and email header and footer, both of which are independently formatted regions. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Netscape and Young-MSDN so that a standard web browser could be used to view the content.

Response to Arguments

13. Applicant's arguments filed 6/24/2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

a. **Regarding Applicant's remarks on p. 10, regarding claims 1, 16, 20, and 23:**

Applicant alleges that Young -MSDN does not teach storing structure information. Applicant also alleges that Young does not teach that the structure information and content information are stored in a single file. The Office disagrees with both allegations.

In regard to the structure information, the Applicant changed all occurrences of “region information” to “structure information.” The Office has done the same, and maintains that Young-MSDN teaches storing structure information. In the cited example (p.7, “Choosing”) there are two <p> tags. This is structure information. It defines that the structure of this code sample includes two paragraphs.

In regard to the structure information and content information being stored in a single file, the Office has newly cited a portion of Young-MSDN that addresses this newly added limitation.

b. Regarding Applicant's remarks on p. 10 regarding dependent claims 2-6, 8, 11, 12, 14, 15, 17, 18, 21, 24, and 25:

Applicant alleges that the claims are patentable due to their dependency on their parent claims. The Office has addressed the alleged deficiencies of the base claims in Section 8a of the instant action.

c. Regarding Applicant's remarks on p. 11, regarding claims 9-10 and 22:

Applicant alleges the claims are patentable, as Young does not teach storing structure and content information in a single file. The Office has addressed this deficiency in Section 8a of the instant action.

d. Regarding Applicant's remarks on p. 11, regarding claims 13, 19, and 26:

Applicant alleges the claims are patentable, as Young does not teach storing structure and content information in a single file. The Office has addressed this deficiency in Section 8a of the instant action.

e. Regarding Applicant's remarks on p. 12, regarding claim 7:

Applicant alleges the claims are patentable, as Young does not teach storing structure and content information in a single file. The Office has addressed this deficiency in Section 8a of the instant action.

Conclusion

14. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

15. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Adam M Queler whose telephone number is (703) 308-5213. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather R Herndon can be reached on (703) 308-5186. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 306-5631.

Application/Control Number: 09/422,976
Art Unit: 2178

Page 10

AQ

Stephens
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2178